

15 Feasibility



Above: San Antonio River, Brenda Tharp; Below: The Milpitas Hacienda, NPS photo

Feasibility

Introduction

To be feasible as a new unit of the national park system, an area must: (1) be of sufficient size and appropriate configuration to ensure sustainable resource protection and visitor enjoyment (taking into account current and potential impacts from sources beyond proposed park boundaries); and (2) be capable of efficient administration by the National Park Service at a reasonable cost (NPS *Management Policies*, 2001, Section 1.3.3).

In evaluating feasibility, the NPS considers a variety of factors, such as:

- Size and boundary configurations;
- Land ownership patterns; current and potential uses of the study area and surrounding lands; local planning and zoning for the study area;
- Access and public enjoyment potential;
- Costs associated with acquisition, development, restoration, and operation;
- Current and potential threats to the resources; existing degradation of resources;
- Level of local and general public support; and
- Economic/socioeconomic impacts of designation as a unit of the national park system.

The feasibility evaluation also considers the ability of the NPS to undertake new management responsibilities in light of current and projected constraints on funding and personnel.

An overall evaluation of feasibility is made after taking into account all of the above factors. However, evaluations may sometimes identify concerns or conditions, rather than simply reach a “yes” or “no” conclusion. For example, some new areas may be feasible additions to the national park system only if landowners are willing to sell; or the boundary encompasses specific areas necessary for visitor access; or state or local governments will provide appropriate assurances that adjacent land uses will remain compatible

with the study area’s resources and values. (NPS *Management Policies*, 2001, Section 1.3.3).

This analysis focuses on the feasibility of NPS designation and management of the study area. Proposals that include management by the NPS and other agencies are discussed in the “Management Options” and “Alternatives” chapters of this draft study report.

The feasibility analysis recognizes that the only part of Fort Hunter Liggett that is available for possible park use is the Base Realignment and Closure process (BRAC) excess property. The feasibility of NPS designation and management is examined separately first, for the BRAC excess property, then for and Fort Hunter Liggett as a whole.

Feasibility - BRAC Excess Property

This section focuses only on the feasibility of NPS designation and management of the BRAC excess property available to the NPS.

BOUNDARY SIZE AND CONFIGURATION

An acceptable boundary for an envisioned unit of the national park system should provide for the inclusion and protection of the primary resource; sufficient surrounding area to provide a proper setting for the resource or to interrelate a group of resources; and sufficient land for appropriate use and development.

The structures declared excess under the BRAC process include the Milpitas Hacienda and related grounds and outbuildings (buildings 100A, 100B, 101, 130) and five ranch bungalows (buildings 124, 127, 131, 132A, 149), a swimming pool (100), tennis court (103), the Gil Adobe (640), and one acre of land under and adjacent to the Tidball Store. Twelve buildings providing 41 housing units (buildings P18 through P29) and 3.5 acres of land including recreational facilities (P32 and P37) in the Javelin Court area have also been identified as available for transfer.

Within the BRAC excess property, the Milpitas Hacienda is the only nationally significant

resource. The Milpitas Hacienda and related buildings are situated on a 21-acre site known as “Hacienda Hill” that the Army has indicated would be transferred along with the buildings. The presumed boundary would therefore include and protect the primary resource of significance.

The setting of the Milpitas Hacienda has been compromised by the development of the cantonment area to the north and east, including addition of new buildings, paved roads and parking lots. However, views of the Milpitas Hacienda in several locations are comparable to views of the Milpitas Hacienda in the 1930s when Hearst used it. Further description of the setting and the cultural landscape of the Milpitas Hacienda can be found in the “Significance” chapter of this report. While most of the landscape that provides the setting for the Milpitas Hacienda would not be within the park boundary, the area is managed by the Army and is expected to retain its current appearance for the foreseeable future. Mission San Antonio de Padua is within view of the Milpitas Hacienda, to the northwest. The Army considers views from the Mission to be sensitive, and restricts training exercises and vehicle movement near the Mission (Army Corps of Engineers 2000). Protection of the Mission viewshed would contribute substantially to the protection of the setting of the Milpitas Hacienda.

The available excess property appears to provide sufficient land for appropriate use and development. The Hacienda Hill provides sufficient land for use of the Milpitas Hacienda. The five ranch bungalows are not nationally significant resources; however, some were part of the historic setting of the Milpitas Hacienda. They are appropriate for park administration, visitor services or staff housing use. The Gil Adobe and land under and adjacent to the Tidball Store are not nationally significant resources, and would not be needed for park management. They are proposed for transfer to local or state agencies or non-profit organizations, and would not be included within a national park unit boundary. The housing at Javelin Court is not a nationally significant resource and would not be needed for park management.

However, this area could be included within a park boundary as a revenue source to offset park development and management costs, or to house park-related staff. In all cases, land surrounding each of these buildings sufficient for access and appropriate use would need to be transferred along with the structures.

The land available for transfer includes and protects the primary resource; provides sufficient surrounding area to provide a proper setting for the resource; and includes sufficient land for appropriate use and development. Establishing a historic site within the land available for transfer would protect historic structures that would offer educational and interpretive opportunities for visitors, in addition to providing continued public use of the Milpitas Hacienda.

LAND USE, OWNERSHIP PATTERNS, PLANNING AND ZONING

The BRAC excess property is currently under federal ownership, managed as part of the Western Training Center for the US Army Reserve. Military bases are included in the Public/Quasi - Public land use category in the *Monterey County General Plan* (Monterey County, 1995 and 2004). As federal land, Fort Hunter Liggett is not subject to local zoning. Jolon Road, which the Tidball Store land abuts, is proposed in the January 2004 draft *Monterey County General Plan* to be designated as a Winery Corridor. This designation would likely be compatible with visitor-serving uses or cultural resource conservation activities at this site.

The BRAC excess property would be available for transfer to the NPS if a national park unit were created, or for transfer to another public agency. The Milpitas Hacienda is currently managed by a concessioner and provides visitor lodging and food service. These uses would be compatible within a park unit.

ACCESS AND PUBLIC ENJOYMENT POTENTIAL

Fort Hunter Liggett is located in southern Monterey County, approximately 20 miles from Highway 101 and 4 miles from the coastal Highway 1 (approximately 25 miles by road from the cantonment area). It is within half a day's drive for over 10 million people in northern and central California.

While no comprehensive visitation numbers exist, based on discussions with managers of the Mission and the Milpitas Hacienda, it appears that at least 22,000 people have visited these sites annually, including military and civilian staff and their guests, military trainees, visitors and parishioners of the Mission San Antonio de Padua, and diners and overnight guests at the Milpitas Hacienda. In addition, approximately 6000 anglers and hunters are estimated to visit Fort Hunter Liggett, for a minimum of 28,000 annual visitors. Visitation numbers presumably declined in 2001 and 2002, based on restricted access after September 11, 2001. However, no visitation numbers have been collected.

The Milpitas Hacienda has strong potential for continued and increased public enjoyment. It is the only extant structure directly associated with William Randolph Hearst and Julia Morgan, outside the Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument, that could be made available for public use; other structures are privately owned. Operated as a restaurant and hotel, the Milpitas Hacienda provides the only possibility for experiential interpretation of the architecture created by the Morgan/Hearst collaboration. There are opportunities for a range of activities, including touring the historic structure, eating in the dining room, staying overnight, and interpretive programs and materials regarding the Hearst years, architect Julia Morgan, early California settlement, and military history.

Access to the BRAC excess property is dependent upon access through other portions of Fort Hunter Liggett. Fort Hunter Liggett policies have generally allowed public access to the cantonment area, Mission San Antonio de Padua and other

inholdings, and on through roads. However, during periods of heightened security concern, access to the installation has sometimes been restricted. While occasional closures for safety or security purposes can be expected, regular and relatively open access to the BRAC excess property is the norm and would be necessary for these areas to function as a public park or historic site. Prolonged closure could impact visitor experiences and jeopardize park budgets, concessioner contracts and economic viability, and other funding sources for resource protection. Access to residential areas, including the Javelin Court area and the ranch bungalows, may be restricted for security purposes.

Unexploded ordnance (UXO) can be found in other portions of Fort Hunter Liggett, but is not known to exist in any of the BRAC excess property or paved and unpaved roads used to reach these areas.

The BRAC excess property provides sufficient potential for public enjoyment for a national park unit. Sufficient public access can be provided to this area, except during the relatively rare times when security or safety issues limit public access.

EXISTING RESOURCE DEGRADATION AND THREATS

Fort Hunter Liggett contains natural and cultural resources of high quality and integrity. The installation has a resource management staff dedicated to protecting these resources.

The Milpitas Hacienda structure is in good to excellent condition with the exception of water damage that has stained and loosened plaster at areas near the open corner towers. There are no immediate threats to this building. A building condition assessment would be needed to identify future needs and priorities for repairs and restoration.

The ranch bungalows are in fair to good condition, and are not subject to immediate threat.

The Gil Adobe is not habitable, but has been stabilized and is not under immediate threat. A partially collapsed redwood shingled roof has



The Gil Adobe with protective tarps, NPS photo

been protected with composition shingles and mineral surface roll roofing. Concrete slabs, porch supports and interior shoring have been installed. Tent-like awnings protect portions of the structure from rain. Seismic retrofitting and repair of the adobe walls would be necessary for reuse. The main roof and porch roofs require reconstruction.

The land surrounding the Tidball Store is fenced. The store structure itself is owned by Monterey County and is in fair condition and not in use.

There are no threats or resource degradation within the BRAC excess property which would preclude designation as a national park unit.

PUBLIC INTEREST AND SUPPORT

Public interest in the Fort Hunter Liggett Special Resource Study process has been moderate. There has been support for NPS involvement in the area, as well as concern about possible NPS restrictions on the mission of Fort Hunter Liggett. There appears to be widespread appreciation of the value of the natural and cultural resources on Fort Hunter Liggett, recognition of Fort Hunter Liggett's protection of those resources to date, and desire for continued public access to the Milpitas Hacienda. A more detailed summary of public comments received during the scoping period can be found in Appendix H.



Palisades area, NPS photo

Major stakeholders in the future of Fort Hunter Liggett and the BRAC excess properties include: Fort Hunter Liggett staff and residents; military units using Fort Hunter Liggett for training (particularly nearby Camp Roberts); the Salinan people, whose ancestors once inhabited this area; the adjacent Los Padres National Forest; California State Parks, which manages Hearst Castle® (Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument); the Monterey Diocese of the Catholic Church, which owns the Mission San Antonio de Padua and surrounding lands; Monterey County Parks Department, which owns the Dutton Hotel and the Tidball Store structure; and the Milpitas Hacienda concessioner. Other interest groups include the California Native Plant Society, the Friends of Historic San Antonio Mission, the San Antonio Valley Historical Association, the Ventana Wilderness Alliance, the Ventana Conservation and Land Trust, the Big Sur Sanctuary Coalition, the Pelican Network, and hunting interests.

Public support and interest appear to be adequate to support designation of a unit of the national park system within the BRAC excess property.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACT

A national park unit involving the BRAC excess property at Fort Hunter Liggett could be expected to increase the number of recreational visitors by approximately 10,000 visitor days per year in the short term. Based on analysis of

visitation at nearby parks, longer term visitation could be substantially higher, from 50,000–75,000, depending on how the area is managed and marketed. These visitors would contribute to the local economy by purchasing various goods and services, including food, gasoline, and lodging. However, these visitation numbers are still small, relative to regional visitation in the Monterey Bay area, Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument, and Big Sur.

Socioeconomic impacts of park designation of the BRAC excess property could be expected to be beneficial and minor to moderate, and would support the feasibility of park designation.

COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, RESTORATION AND OPERATION
Cost estimates for land acquisition/property transfer, initial planning and development, capital improvements, maintenance of structures, park operations and affiliated area assistance are described in the “Alternatives” chapter, along with costs and revenues from Javelin Court housing rental.

The following findings are based on the cost estimates developed for the alternatives:

Acquisition and Development: Costs for acquisition of BRAC excess property are waived and the property transfer should be a “No Cost Transfer” to the receiving agency. However, all indirect costs are to be paid by the receiving agency. Costs for site surveys, initial research and planning, renovation and development of visitor facilities would be moderate, but are beyond the capability of the NPS at this time.

Park Operations, Maintenance, Restoration and Capital Costs: The NPS estimated park operations costs at approximately \$400,000 annually, assuming a concessioner offers lodging and food services in the Milpitas Hacienda and funds the structure’s routine maintenance and certain operational aspects. Annual operating budgets for several comparable National Historic Sites are presented in Table 11: National Historic Site Annual Operating Budgets, for comparison.

Major capital investment in the Milpitas Hacienda would at some point be necessary. A study of the hospitality potential at the Milpitas Hacienda suggests that necessary capital investment and cyclic maintenance for the Milpitas Hacienda can feasibly be financed by a concessioner (Bay Area Economics, 2001). “As is” renovation of the Milpitas Hacienda could cost

Table 11: National Historic Site Annual Operating Budgets

Historic Site	Historic Structure/ Feature	Annual Operating Budget	Annual Visitation
Carl Sandburg NHS, NC	Residence, dairy goat barn, farmland	\$ 932,000	38,000
Eisenhower NHS, PA	Residence, farmland, barns, cattle operation	\$1,036,000	76,000
Eugene O’Neill NHS, CA	Residence, courtyard, orchards	\$ 360,000	3,700
John Muir NHS, CA	14 room Muir house, Martinez Adobe, orchard, oak woodlands	\$ 639,000	27,000
Ulysses S Grant NHS, MO	Main house, barn, outbuildings	\$ 561,000	25,000
Vanderbilt Mansion NHS, NY	54 room mansion, gardens	\$1,111,000	389,000

Source: National Park Service

\$300,000 and would include new finishes in rooms, upgrades to fixtures and furnishings, and upgrading of mechanical systems. This renovation cost would be incurred by the concessioner and could be financed through increased room rates. Full rehabilitation of the Milpitas Hacienda to a high quality, full-service hospitality operation could cost \$3–6 million (Bay Area Economics, 2001). Renovation of Building 124 for administrative offices and/or visitor center could cost \$400,000. Full renovation of the other ranch bungalows could cost \$1 million (NPS-PWRO Facility Management Program).

Based on NPS budget constraints and financial priorities, the NPS is not currently able to undertake new park management responsibilities of this potential cost and magnitude. California State Parks could feasibly fund annual park operations, provided: a) cost savings can be achieved by sharing staff, equipment and administrative services with Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument, and b) suitable concession arrangements can be made to ensure adaptive use of the Hacienda complex and to retain the franchise fees from the concession contract for park use at Fort Hunter Liggett. Technical and limited financial assistance from the NPS could be feasible in areas such as historical research, historic preservation, interpretation and fundraising. The cost of this technical assistance is estimated at up to \$50,000 per year for central office staff time or contracted projects. These costs may be incurred on an irregular basis, depending on need and availability of funding.

Gil Adobe and Tidball Store: The costs of NPS management of the Gil Adobe and land under and adjacent to the Tidball Store was not assessed, because these areas are not nationally significant and not suitable for management in a national park unit. These areas could be managed by Monterey County Parks Department, California State Parks or a non-profit. Costs for basic stabilization to maintain current conditions would likely be minimal. Costs for full rehabilitation of the Gil Adobe could be substantial.

Javelin Court: Net revenues from housing rental at Javelin Court may be able to be used to offset park operational costs. In the near term, those net revenues may be able to fully cover park operational costs. In the longer term, management of the housing may cease to provide net revenues when cyclic maintenance and repair and rehabilitation costs increase. In the short term, revenues from ownership and management of the Javelin Court area could increase the feasibility of managing the other BRAC excess property.

AFFILIATED AREA DESIGNATION

In cases where a study area's resources meet criteria for national significance but do not meet other criteria for inclusion in the national park system, the NPS may instead recommend an alternative status, such as "affiliated area" (NPS 2001a). Affiliated areas are nationally significant areas not owned or administered by the NPS, but which draw on technical or financial assistance from the NPS (NPS 2001b). To be eligible for "affiliated area" status, an area's resources must: (1) meet the same standards for national significance that apply to units of the national park system; (2) require some special recognition or technical assistance beyond what is available through existing NPS programs; (3) be managed in accordance with the policies and standards that apply to units of the national park system; and (4) be assured of sustained resource protection, as documented in a formal agreement between the NPS and the non-federal management entity (NPS *Management Policies*, 2001, Section 1.3.4). Although it is not feasible for the NPS to own or manage the BRAC excess property at Fort Hunter Liggett, the Milpitas Hacienda, meets the criteria for an affiliated area of the national park system, as described below.

(1) Meet standards of national significance.

The Milpitas Hacienda meets the national significance criteria that apply to units of the national park system. As described in the "Significance" chapter of this draft study report, the Milpitas Hacienda is a contributing element of a larger site (the Hearst estate) that is nationally significant for its association with architect Julia

Morgan and media magnate William Randolph Hearst. As the northernmost outpost of a 250,000-acre country estate that Hearst amassed in the 1920s and 1930s, the Hacienda provides an opportunity to expand and enhance the story of Hearst and his collaboration with Morgan. Hearst's building of this estate mirrored the building of the media empire through which Hearst was known to influence masses of people in events of national and international importance.

(2) Require special recognition or technical assistance beyond what is available through existing NPS programs. The addition of the Milpitas Hacienda and associated ranch bungalows to the Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument would increase the need for further studies and assessments to determine management and interpretation goals for the structures. California State Parks has requested NPS technical assistance in developing such studies, assessments and plans. California State Parks has identified several areas of NPS assistance and expertise that could contribute to effective management of the resources including:

- Assistance in developing a management plan for the Milpitas Hacienda as a component of the Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument.
- Assistance in documenting the history and significance of the Milpitas Hacienda as part of Hearst's historic estate, assessing the condition of the building, and developing historic preservation treatment plans;
- Assistance in analysis of the cultural landscape and development of historic preservation treatment plans;
- Assistance in developing a long range interpretive plan; and
- Assistance in developing funding sources for rehabilitation or restoration.

If added to the Hearst San Simeon Estate National Historic Landmark (NHL), the Milpitas Hacienda would be eligible to receive NPS

technical assistance through the National Historic Landmarks Assistance Program. Assistance through this program includes forums for communication with NHL owners, managers and friends; technical publications related to preservation; and information about additional Federal assistance for which NHLs may qualify. The assistance sought by California State Parks would exceed the level of assistance that is currently available to NHLs.

As described in the "Suitability" chapter of this study report, there are currently no national park units or other public sites that expand significantly upon the Hearst/Morgan story. Designation by Congress as an affiliated area would enable the NPS to provide additional recognition and technical assistance and would provide the opportunity to expand and broaden the interpretive themes of the Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument.

In addition to technical assistance, affiliated area designation would provide additional benefits through a long-term partnership and formal recognition of the Milpitas Hacienda. In the long term, the Congressional and NPS recognition associated with affiliated area designation would provide greater opportunities to leverage necessary funds from both public and private sector sources for operation, rehabilitation or restoration of the historic structures.

(3) Management in accordance with the policies and standards that apply to units of the national park system. Areas that are recognized and identified as affiliated units of the national park system, must meet certain basic standards (NPS 1990b). For example, the Milpitas Hacienda would be subject to the Secretary of the Interior's standards for historic preservation and would be required to meet the mandates of the National Historic Preservation Act. A formal agreement or preservation covenant could affirm long-term sustained protection of the Milpitas Hacienda according to the Secretary of the Interior's standards for historic preservation.

An agreement between the NPS and California State Parks would need to be developed to address policies on other operational issues such as accessibility for disabled visitors, content and scope of interpretive programs, standards for concession operations, fees, fiscal controls, non - discrimination in employment, and other areas of concern. Prior to Congressional designation as an affiliated area, further discussion with California State Parks would be necessary to ensure that state management standards and procedures for park management are acceptable to the NPS.

(4) Assurance of sustained resource protection, as documented in a formal agreement between the NPS and California State Parks. Ownership and management responsibility would remain with California State Parks if the Milpitas Hacienda is designated as an affiliated area of the national park system. Increased technical assistance for interpretation and resource management under the affiliated area designation would contribute to sustained resource protection for the Milpitas Hacienda. Documentation of the California State Parks commitment to sustained resource protection would be included in a formal agreement. A cooperative agreement has been in place between the NPS and California State Parks since 1994, documenting the two agencies' commitments to cooperate on the protection and management of several national and state parks.

Summary. The Milpitas Hacienda meets the criteria for recognition as an affiliated area of the national park system. Affiliated area designation would provide California State Parks with increased technical assistance in interpreting and protecting the resources as they relate to the cultural heritage themes expressed in units of the national park system. In the long term, affiliated area designation could provide greater opportunities to leverage public and private funding through partnerships. Affiliated area recognition would enhance the overall feasibility of managing the Milpitas Hacienda and the associated ranch bungalows for public enjoyment. However, further detailed discussion and

agreement between California State Parks and the National Park Service should occur prior to designation as an affiliated area to ensure that state management standards and procedures for park management are acceptable to the NPS.



Hacienda restaurant, NPS photo

Feasibility - Fort Hunter Liggett Study Area

This section of the feasibility analysis focuses on Fort Hunter Liggett as a whole, while recognizing that the only land available for possible park use is the BRAC excess property evaluated in the previous section.

BOUNDARY SIZE AND CONFIGURATION

The 164,261 acre study area, encompassing all of Fort Hunter Liggett, contains exceptional natural resources and biological communities of a relatively undisturbed and expansive nature, historic resources listed on the National Register of Historic Places, at least 600 archeological sites, and a cultural landscape illustrating the broad sweep of California history. The study area would be sufficient to protect these resources and provide a suitable setting for them, and would provide sufficient land for appropriate use and development. However, this area is not available for transfer to the NPS because it is in use as an Army Reserve installation.

LAND USE, OWNERSHIP PATTERNS, PLANNING AND ZONING

All study area lands are within Fort Hunter Liggett, under federal ownership, and managed as part of the Western Training Center for the US Army Reserves. Military bases are included in the Public/Quasi-Public land use category in the *Monterey County General Plan* (Monterey County 1995 and 2004). As federal land, Fort Hunter Liggett is not subject to local zoning.

All lands and facilities other than those determined excess through the BRAC process have been determined by the Army to be necessary to the Fort Hunter Liggett training mission, and are expected to be retained by Fort Hunter Liggett for the indefinite future. These lands are therefore not available for transfer to the NPS or any other organization.

Inholdings within Fort Hunter Liggett include Mission San Antonio de Padua, Saint Luke's Episcopal Church and cemetery, and the Tidball Store structure. These lands are not the subject of this study. However, current uses would be compatible with national park unit designation.

ACCESS AND PUBLIC ENJOYMENT POTENTIAL

The natural and cultural resources of Fort Hunter Liggett have strong potential, based on their quality and integrity, for public enjoyment. The oak woodland and savanna ecosystems and the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail are particularly strong attractions. Fort Hunter Liggett draws a steady stream of visitors who drive through to enjoy the scenery, or who visit the Milpitas Hacienda or Mission in part because of the installation's pastoral setting.

The Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a) provides for "(A) the conservation and rehabilitation of natural resources on military installations; (B) the sustainable multi-purpose use of the resources, which shall include hunting, fishing, trapping, and nonconsumptive uses; and (C) subject to safety requirements and military security, public access to military installations to facilitate the use." Fort Hunter Liggett's public access program currently

focuses on hunting and fishing opportunities.

Access to Fort Hunter Liggett is from Highway 101 via Jolon Road (County Road G14) or Lockwood Road (County Road G18), or from Highway 1 via Nacimiento - Fergusson Road. Within Fort Hunter Liggett, public access is limited to Jolon, Mission Creek, Nacimiento-Fergusson, Infantry and Del Venturi roads. These roads provide access to the cantonment area and the various inholdings, and offering a route through the Santa Lucia Mountains to the Pacific Coast. An unknown number of people traverse Nacimiento-Fergusson Road to US Forest Service (USFS) lands or the Pacific Coast. Certain roads are closed to the public under high security alert conditions or when training activities require temporary closure.

Hunters and anglers are allowed access to the installation through day-use permits, as provided for by the Sikes Act, as described above. Access is permitted only when it does not conflict with training needs and safety requirements. An extensive network of unpaved roads and trails exists and is currently used for hunting/fishing access.

Unexploded ordnance (UXO) is known to exist in some of the undeveloped areas of Fort Hunter Liggett, limiting the potential for public access to these areas. Ordnance has been used throughout Fort Hunter Liggett since its establishment as a military reservation during World War II. Since the 1970s training units have been required to police the area for UXO upon the completion of their training. Despite the policy, a US Army Corps of Engineers study concluded that ordnance has been found in virtually every training area (US Army Corps of Engineers 1999). While impact areas such as the Gabilan and Stony valleys have a higher concentration of UXO than areas with lesser use, few areas outside the cantonment area have been fully tested or cleared of UXO.

While hunters, anglers and sightseers clearly enjoy the areas that are available to them, access and enjoyment potential are limited by ongoing military training activities and the presence of UXO. Until such time as the UXO is completely

removed, the risk of accidental or intentional detonation, and the resulting damage or injury, is greater than the National Park Service is willing to undertake. Because of safety issues, the Fort Hunter Liggett installation, outside the BRAC excess property, does not currently provide sufficient access and public enjoyment potential to be feasible as a unit of the national park system. In addition, this area is not available for transfer to the NPS because it is in use as an Army Reserve installation.

EXISTING RESOURCE DEGRADATION AND THREATS

Military training on Fort Hunter Liggett that may affect significant natural resources includes activities such as live-fire exercises, field maneuvers, fixed-range firing, aviation, or weapons testing (Clark 2000). Military operations and wildfires have increased soil erosion. Wheeled and tracked traffic has also impacted archeological sites: 81% of surveyed sites showed evidence of such disturbance (Eidsness and Jackson 1994b).

Fires at Fort Hunter Liggett are caused by natural occurrence, training or other human activity, and controlled burns. Fort Hunter Liggett has adopted a plan for controlled burns in order to reduce the fuel load in areas used for live fire exercises, for chaparral management, to reduce star-thistle, break up even-aged stands of chaparral to improve wildlife habitat, reduce cattail stands at reservoirs, and to protect against fires escaping off-post onto private land. Military training occurring during the hot, dry summer has the greatest potential to ignite wildfires.

The oak woodlands and savannas of Fort Hunter Liggett may be threatened by Sudden Oak Death (*Phytophthora ramorum*), which has been found in Monterey County.

Resource degradation and threats to the resources at Fort Hunter Liggett would not preclude designation as a unit of the national park system. However, this area is not available for transfer because it is in use as an Army Reserve installation.

PUBLIC INTEREST AND SUPPORT

If the area were ever declared excess to military use and made available to the NPS, an assessment of the level of support for a broader park unit would be needed.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACT

A national park unit involving the broader Fort Hunter Liggett installation could have substantial socioeconomic impacts, primarily from increased visitation and public and private investments in visitor services. Impacts would depend on the scale of the park and the level of continuing military use. Socioeconomic impacts of a park unit involving the broader Fort Hunter Liggett installation have not been assessed, as the area is not available for transfer as a park unit.

COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, RESTORATION AND OPERATION

The costs of establishing a national park unit in the broader Fort Hunter Liggett installation have not been determined, as this area is in use as an Army Reserve training installation and is not available for transfer to the NPS. If any such transfer were to occur, land acquisition costs would presumably be minimal. The National Park Service would accept transfer of such property only after appropriate cleanup of unexploded ordnance and other hazardous materials. Park development and operations costs could be substantial. Table 12: National Park Unit Annual Operating Budgets provides park operating budgets for a selection of existing national park units. Based on these costs, management of a larger national park at Fort Hunter Liggett could be estimated at \$1–5 million annually. Capital investment could be required for facilities such as a visitor center, restroom facilities, parking areas, campgrounds, etc. Within the context of the commitments of the President, the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the National Park Service to address existing national financial priorities, the NPS is not able to undertake new park management responsibilities of this potential cost and magnitude at this time.

Table 12: National Park Unit Annual Operating Budgets

Park	Annual Operating Budget	Acreage	Annual Visitation
Big Thicket National Preserve, TX	\$2,300,000	97,000	103,000
Great Basin National Park, NV	\$1,900,000	77,000	87,000
Lassen Volcanic National Park, CA	\$3,700,000	106,000	387,000
Lava Beds National Monument, CA	\$1,200,000	46,500	114,000
North Cascades National Park WA	\$5,500,000	684,000	390,000
Pinnacles National Monument, CA	\$2,200,000	17,600	165,000
Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, CA	\$5,200,000	153,700	469,000
Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve, KS	\$900,000	11,000	17,000

Source: National Park Service

Feasibility Determination

The National Park Service considers a variety of factors in evaluating the feasibility of NPS designations. These factors and related feasibility issues are summarized in the table below.

Table 13. Feasibility Determination Summary

Feasibility factors	Issues and Conclusions	NPS Management Feasible?	
		BRAC Excess	All FHL
Boundary size and configuration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BRAC excess property available for transfer would protect the primary resource (the Hacienda complex); provide sufficient surrounding area to provide a proper setting for the resource; and include sufficient land for appropriate use and development. Fort Hunter Liggett as a whole would be sufficient to protect significant natural and cultural resources and provide a suitable setting for them, and would provide sufficient land for appropriate use and development. However, this area is not available for transfer because it is in use as an Army Reserve installation. 	Yes	No – not available
Land use, ownership patterns, planning and zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BRAC excess property is available for transfer to NPS ownership and management. All other lands and facilities have been determined to be necessary to the Fort Hunter Liggett training mission, and are expected to be retained by Fort Hunter Liggett for the indefinite future. National park unit designation in these areas is therefore not feasible at this time. 	Yes	No – not available

Access and public enjoyment potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BRAC excess property provides sufficient public access and potential for public enjoyment for a national park unit focused on these structures to be feasible. Based on safety concerns, the remainder of the installation does not currently provide sufficient access and public enjoyment potential to be feasible as a unit of the national park system. In addition, this area is not available for transfer because it is in use as an Army Reserve installation. 	Yes	No
Existing resource degradation and threats to the resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource degradation and threats to the resources at Fort Hunter Liggett would not preclude designation of the BRAC excess property or the installation as a whole as a unit of the national park system. However, only the BRAC excess property is available to the NPS. 	Yes	No – not available
Public interest and support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public interest and support appears to be adequate to support designation of a unit of the national park system within the BRAC excess property. If the area were ever declared excess to military use, an assessment of the level of support for a broader park unit would be needed. 	Yes	Unknown
Social and economic impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic impacts of park unit designation of the excess property could be expected to be minor and beneficial, and would not affect the feasibility of a park unit designation. If substantial portions of Fort Hunter Liggett were ever made available to the NPS for a larger national park unit, the socioeconomic impacts could be significant, and would need to be assessed at that time. 	Yes	Unknown
Costs associated with acquisition, development, restoration and operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment of the BRAC excess property as a unit of the national park system is not feasible based on current NPS budget constraints and financial priorities. Establishment of the entire FHL installation as a national park unit is not feasible at this time. While land acquisition costs would be negligible, park development and operations costs could be substantial. Within the context of the commitments of the President, Secretary of the Interior and Director of the NPS to address the NPS deferred maintenance backlog and other national financial priorities, the NPS is not able to undertake new park management responsibilities of this potential cost and magnitude at this time. In addition, this area is not available for transfer because it is in use as an Army Reserve installation. 	No	No
Affiliated Area of the national park system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designation of the Milpitas Hacienda as an affiliated area of the national park system, is feasible, provided California State Parks owns and manages the area as part of its Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument. 	Yes	Unknown
Gil Adobe and Tidball Store	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These areas are not nationally significant and not suitable for management in a national park unit. 	No	No

Summary

BRAC Excess Property: The National Park Service finds that it is not feasible to manage the Fort Hunter Liggett BRAC excess property as a national park unit. Based on current NPS budget constraints and financial priorities, the NPS is not able to undertake new park management responsibilities of this potential cost and magnitude.

California State Parks could feasibly fund annual park operations, provided: a) cost savings can be achieved by sharing staff, equipment and administrative services with Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument, and b) suitable concession arrangements can be made to ensure adaptive use of the Hacienda complex and to retain the franchise fees from the concession contract for park use at Fort Hunter Liggett. A study of the hospitality potential at the Milpitas Hacienda suggests that necessary capital investment and cyclic maintenance for the Milpitas Hacienda can feasibly be financed by a concessioner (Bay Area Economics 2001).

The Milpitas Hacienda, if managed as part of the Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument, could feasibly be designated as an affiliated area of the national park system. Limited technical and financial assistance from the NPS could be feasible in areas such as historical research, treatment of historic structures, interpretation and fundraising.

Fort Hunter Liggett: The Fort Hunter Liggett study area as a whole is not a feasible addition to the national park system because the land continues to be an active Army Reserve training installation, and is not available to the National Park Service. Cost issues and the presence of unexploded ordnance would also be barriers to NPS management.